

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of

**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116**

Ji Eun LEE et al.

Confirmation No.: 2659

Serial No.: 09/964,533

Group Art Unit: 2621

Filed: 9/28/2001

Examiner: Jamie J. VENT

**Customer No.: 34610**

For: INTELLIGENT VIDEO SYSTEM

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window, **Mail Stop AF**  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

Claims 1-8 and 10-31 are pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated July 27, 2007.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the courtesies extended by Examiner Vent during the personal interview on November 19 with applicants' representative, Mr. Oren. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks. This document serves as the substance of the interview. As stated in the Interview Summary, applicants' arguments overcome the prior art. The application should therefore be in condition for allowance.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 10, 12-25 and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by U.S. Patent 5,615,018 to Wu et al. (hereafter Wu) in view of U.S. Patent 5,377,051 to Lane et al.

(hereafter Lane). The Office Action also rejects claims 11, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wu in view of Lane and U.S. Patent 6,400,996 to Hoffberg. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites calculating complexity of a video story development based on motion information by sequentially indexing an entire video, determining a play speed using the calculated motion-based complexity, and variably controlling the play speed of the video based on the determined play speed. Independent claim 1 also recites that the complexity is defined based on additional information on a length of shot segment, wherein the complexity is defined as simple in a case that a length of a shot segment is long and the complexity is defined as more complicated in a case that shots having short shot segments consecutively appear.

The Office Action (on pages 3-4) states that Wu does not teach or suggest the features related to complexity being defined based on a length of shot segment. The Office (on page 4) then relies on Lane's FIG. 12D and col. 13, lines 20-67 for the missing features. However, as discussed during the personal interview, Lane relates to an MPEG compression that utilizes motion compensated predictive coding and adaptive Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT) quantization. The cited section of Lane merely discloses that a quantization factor is determined based on a scene complexity. Lane also does not utilize 'scene complexity' to relate to calculating a complexity and/or determining a play speed, as recited in independent claim 1. Lane does not teach or suggest that the complexity is defined as simple in a case that a length of a shot segment is long and the complexity is defined as more complicated in a case that shots having short shot

segments consecutively appear. Lane therefore does not teach or suggest the features of Wu missing from Lane.

Additionally, there is no suggestion in the prior art to modify Wu based on Lane's disclosure. Wu relates to a variable speed search and Lane relates to MPEG compression. Lane does not teach or suggest the claimed features relating to shot segments, the defining of complexity based on shot segments and/or determining a play speed using the calculated motion-based complexity.

Wu and Lane do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. See, for example, the Interview Summary Record stating that the argument informally overcome the outstanding rejection. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 23 recites that the content complexity is defined based on additional information on a length of shot segment, wherein the content complexity is defined as simple in a case that a length of a shot segment is long and the content complexity is defined as more complicated in a case that shots having short shot segments consecutively appear.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 23. Lane does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 23 missing from Wu. Additionally, there is no suggestion in the prior art to modify Wu based on Lane's disclosure. Thus, independent claim 23 defines patentable subject matter.

Reply to Office Action dated July 27, 2007

Independent claim 25 recites a means for calculating a complexity of video content, and a means for playing and displaying the corresponding video in different play speeds for each specific interval on the basis of the stored content complexity. Independent claim 25 further recites that the content complexity is defined based on additional information on a length of shot segment, wherein the content complexity is defined as simple in a case that a length of a shot segment is long and the content complexity is defined as more complicated in a case that shots having short shot segments consecutively appear.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 25. Lane does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 25 missing from Wu. Additionally, there is no suggestion in the prior art to modify Wu based on Lane's disclosure. Thus, independent claim 25 defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 23 and 25 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-8 and 10-31 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the

Serial No. 09/964,533

Docket No. LGE-0015

Reply to Office Action dated July 27, 2007

application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

**Date: November 21, 2007**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**